

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 6, 25, 28, 30, 38, 40, 41, 50 and 54 have been amended, claims 20-23, 26, 27, 29, 48, 49, 52, 53 and 55 have been cancelled and new claims 57 and 58 have been added. New claim 58 is similar to claim 1, as it stood before the amendments herein, with amendments as discussed in the Interview conducted on June 4, 2004.

**Rejections Under 35 USC 112**

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-14 and 39-42 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It is not clear what aspects of these claims the examiner finds not-enabled since the Examiner has repeated the claim language with no indication of the specific aspects of the claim that the Examiner regards as problematic. The last amendments made to claims 11-14 and 39-42 were in the response dated April 16, 2003 and no rejections under 35 USC 112 were made to these claims in the subsequent official action dated July 31, 2003 in which the Examiner appeared to consider these claims quite carefully to make the rejections based on Blust et al. under 35 USC 103(a).

Nevertheless applicant respectfully submits the rejection is improper. Referring to applicant's disclosure and drawings, Figure 1 and its associated text on p. 6-10 describe communications units having respective expansion interfaces 28, 30, 32 and 34. (p.7, lines 15-18). Different types of communication interfaces may be connected to the expansion interfaces as described on p. 7 beginning at line 30 to p.8 line 11. The functionality enabling any communication appliance to access any wireless transceiver port is described on p.9 at lines 2-8 and examples are given on the remainder of page 9 and lines 1-5 on page 10. Line 6 of page 10 begins "In order to provide the above functionality, a representative communication unit... is shown schematically at 12 in Figure 2. In this embodiment, the first communications unit 12 is comprised of a processor circuit 60 including a microprocessor 62..." At page 10, lines 9-13, the microprocessor 62 is

described as being "in communication with a wireless transceiver interface 64 and a common medium interface 66, which provides for communication with other communications units in the system shown in Figure 1." Cooperation between the wireless transceiver interface and the common medium interface are then described in detail. From the foregoing it will readily be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art that in the embodiment described the processor circuit implements the expansion interface through cooperation with the common medium interface.

On p.13 at line 14 the specification states "the microprocessor 62 in each communications unit 12, 16 is programmed to be responsive to programming commands which may be received at the wireless transceiver interface 64, the communication appliance interface 36, the PCM bus 76, or a separate programming port 90. On p. 13 at line 18 an example of programming commands being received in the form of DTMF tones and interpreted through a lookup table that direct the microprocessor to programming routines 102 is described. At p. 14, line 11 the specification states, "Effectively, these routines 102 direct the microprocessor 62 to store in the RAM 65 a programming configuration 104 including flags 106, module identifications and names 110". The description is very detailed and it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand from the provided description how to program the microprocessor to effect the functionality of the expansion interface, thereby effectively causing the first expansion interface to be programmable by commands received at the communications appliance interface as recited in claim 11, for example.

In addition to the parts of the description pointed out in connection with the rejection of claim 11, description specifically relating to claim 12 is provided on p. 13 at line 14 mentioned above.

The subject matter of claim 13 is enabled by at least the disclosure mentioned above in connection with claim 11 and is particularly related to the language that "the first expansion interface is programmable to cause said first wireless

transceiver port to selectively communicate with one of a plurality of communications units operable to communicate with said first expansion interface”, by the description associated with Figure 1 on pages 6-10 and the language on p 10 at line 6 that beings “In order to provide such functionality...”.

As for claim 14, p.13 describes DTMF tones used for programming and being generated by a communications appliance in communication with the communications appliance interface.

Similar comments apply to clams 39-42 which are generally similar to claims 11-14, but written in method form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-14 and claims 39-42 are enabled and satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112 first paragraph and that the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 112 first paragraph is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 40 and 41 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to the recital of “said second communications unit” in claim 40 for which there is alleged no antecedent basis. Claim 40 has been amended to replace the offending phrase with reference to “said at least one of said respective communications units” for which antecedent basis is provided by the amendments to claim 30, from which claim 40 depends. Consequently, applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claims 40 and 41 is overcome.

#### Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, 20-22, 25-28, 30, 33, 35-38, 44, 48, 52-54 and 56 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Berry et al. (US 5,953,676). Under 35 USC 103(a) the Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 31 as being unpatentable in view of Berry in view of Lu et al (US Patent Appn Pubn No. 2002/0009991), claims 3 and 32 as being

unpatentable over Berry in view of Basile (US 4,519,074) claim 8 as being unpatentable over Berry in view of alleged well-known prior art and claims 17, 18, 45 and 46 as being unpatentable over Berry in view of Schornack et al (US 5,946,616).

Claims 11-14 and 39-42 do not appear to be rejected on the basis of any prior art and thus the Examiner's view of the status of these claims in view of the prior art is unknown. In any event, the amendments herein cause these claims to be dependent upon claims that have been amended to include subject matter the Examiner has indicated to be allowable and thus it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable due to this dependence and due to the additional subject matter each claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 20-23 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Consequently, the rejection of claim 1 is overcome. The rejection of claims 2-4, 6-10, 16-18, and 56 which ultimately depend from amended claim 1 are overcome due to this dependence and due to the additional subject matter each claims. The rejection of claims 20-22 is overcome by cancellation of these claims.

Claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 26, 27 and 29 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Consequently, the rejection of claim 25 is overcome and the rejection of claim 28 which has been amended to depend from claim 25 is overcome due to this dependence and due to the additional subject matter it claims. The rejection of claims 26 and 27 is overcome by cancellation of these claims.

Claim 30 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 48 and 49 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Consequently, the rejection of claim 30 is overcome and the rejection of claims 31-33, 35-38, 44-46 is overcome due to their ultimate dependence upon amended claim 30 and due to the additional subject matter each claims. The rejection of claims 48, 52 and 53 is overcome by cancellation of these claims.